

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Final Office Action of March 5, 2010. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections of the Examiner. Reconsideration and further examination is respectfully requested.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for his helpfulness during a telephone interview performed with the undersigned Attorney with regard to the previous claim rejections. The amendments herein are respectfully intended to reflect the substance of that interview.

No new matter has been added.

Claims 3-5, 9, and 13-16 stand rejected for non-statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101. Amendments to the claims herein are respectfully to meet all requirements in this regard.

Claims 3-5, 9, 13-16, and 21-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Amendments to the claims herein are respectfully believed to meet all requirements in this regard.

Claims 3-5, 9, 13-16, and 20-28, and 30-36 stand rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 based on the combination of U.S. patent 6,792,145 ("Gay"), U.S. patent 5,903,646 ("Rackman"), U.S. patent application publication 2004/0205535 ("Newman et al."), and U.S. patent 6,330,589 ("Kennedy"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Gay discloses extracting textual and tabular data from a financial document, and making comparisons to determine the type of data schedule material provided in the document. Gay compares the character strings of the financial document to character strings in previous documents or in various databases. The database of the previous document includes textual material in a first plane, and tabular material also in the first plane. If a character string match is

made between a new document and an old document, Gay teaches that the new tabular data material is provided in a data matrix in a second plane but the corresponding textual material would not be included in the textual matrix provided in the second plane.

Rackman discloses an access control system for litigation document production. Documents in Rackman are produced as stored images on an optical disk, and documents which are to be redacted or maintained confidential are stored in encrypted form. Rackman teaches that as the litigation progresses, access by the opposing counsel/party to additional documents can be effected by distributing appropriate decryption keys.

Newman et al. discloses displaying tree-structured information in a "treetable" that is a table-like display structure, in which each path from a root to a leaf node is represented by a single column, and cells representing the immediate successors of a node are placed immediately under that node. Variation in the amount of space given to cells within particular columns of the Newman et al. display structure allows detail to be given for selected paths and subtrees. Newman et al. teaches that extraction of subparts of a treetable into another such structure may be used for deeper exploration of trees.

Kennedy discloses using a client database to manage conversation threads. In the Kennedy system, a news message threading scheme is converted to a conversation threading scheme that can be managed by a MAPI type of application. In the client database of Kennedy, the trees of Figs. 4a and 4b are converted to the MAPI format shown in Figs. 4c and 4d. Kennedy discloses that when a reference is detected to a message that has not yet been downloaded from a server to the client, a placeholder may be generated. See Fig. 11, and lines 14-27 in column 23. When the message placeholder of Kennedy is subsequently encountered, a

download operation is performed to download the message represented by the placeholder. See step 530 in Fig. 8.

Nowhere in the combination of Gay, Rackman, Newman et al. and Kennedy is there disclosed or suggested a method or system that includes:

. . . modifying, by the computer system, the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages in response to detecting the deletion of the original electronic mail message to include a modified graphical representation of the original electronic mail message, the modified graphical representation of the original electronic mail message within the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages visually indicating that the original document has been deleted. . .
(emphasis added)

as, for example, in the present independent claim 3. In contrast, Gay teaches a technique for ensuring that a date of a document is valid from line 26 in column 27 through line 10 in column 8, Rackman describes counting pages in a document by determining the start of a scan of a new document in lines 15-46 in column 8, Newman et al. teach displaying a table-like “treetable” structure (Fig. 1), and Kennedy discloses entering placement holders into a client side database for messages that have not yet been downloaded, so that such messages can later be identified and downloaded (See Fig. 11 and Fig 8).

Applicants respectfully note that Kennedy teaches away from tree representations, since a fundamental purpose of the Kennedy system is to convert tree structured information within the client database (Figs. 4a and 4b) into MAPI formatted data (Figs. 4c and 4d) for use by MAPI applications.

Moreover, like Gay, Rackman, and Newman et al., Kennedy is silent with regard to any way of preserving the display of deleted documents within a visually displayed tree message structure such that the deleted documents are graphically displayed in a way that indicates that

they have been deleted. Kennedy describes deleting messages only with regard to default and leave on server modes of operation (column 8, lines 35-44) – neither of which provides any suggestion of any need to preserve a visual display of a tree structure including a modified graphical representation of a deleted message.

Applicants further maintain the previously submitted arguments that that the amended present claims are not directed in whole or part to “nonfunctional descriptive material.”

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, the combination of Gay, Rackman, Newman et al. and Kennedy does not disclose or suggest *modifying, by the computer system, the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages in response to detecting the deletion of the original electronic mail message to include a modified graphical representation of the original electronic mail message, the modified graphical representation of the original electronic mail message within the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages visually indicating that the original document has been deleted*, as in the present independent claims 3 and 9.

It should also be understood from the above discussion that the combination of Gay, Rackman, Newman et al. and Kennedy does not disclose or suggest a system that includes *modifying, by the computer system, the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages in response to detecting the deletion of the original electronic mail message to include a modified graphical representation of the original electronic mail message, the modified graphical representation of the original electronic mail message within the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages after deleting of the original electronic mail message visually*

indicating that the original electronic mail message has been deleted, as in the present independent claim 21 and 24.

And it should further be understood from the above discussion that the combination of Gay, Rackman, Newman et al. and Kennedy also does not disclose or suggest a computer program product that includes program code for *modifying the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages in response to detecting the deletion of the original electronic mail message to include a modified graphical representation of the original electronic mail message, the modified graphical representation of the original electronic mail message within the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages after deleting of the original electronic mail message visually indicating that the original electronic mail message has been deleted*, as in the present independent claims 30 and 33.

For the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully urge that the combination of Gay, Rackman, Newman et al. and Kennedy does not disclose all the features of the remaining independent claims 3, 9, 21, 24, 30 and 33. Accordingly, Gay, Rackman, Newman et al. and Kennedy do not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 with regard to the present independent claims. As to the remaining claims, they each depend from the previously discussed independent claims, and are respectfully believed to be patentable over the combination of Gay, Rackman, Newman et al. and Kennedy for at least the same reasons.

Reconsideration of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants have cancelled and amended claims herein. However, Applicants are not conceding in this application that cancelled and/or unamended claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments are only for facilitating expeditious

prosecution of allowable subject matter. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue the cancelled and/or unamended claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned, Applicants' Attorney at 617-630-1131 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

September 6, 2010
Date

/David Dagg/
David Dagg, Reg. No. 37,809
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
44 Chapin Road
Newton, MA 02459
(617) 630-1131

Docket No. 260-137